

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Replacement sheets for pages 5/8, 6/8, 7/8 and 8/8, which contain Figures 4A, 4B, 5 and 6, respectively, are attached.

### REMARKS

The Office action dated July 28, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in response thereto.

Replacement Sheets for the drawings are submitted as an attachment to this Amendment. The Replacement Sheets add arrowheads to the lines connecting the flow-charts, in accordance with a request of the Office action.

Certain claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Each of those claims have been amended in accordance with the suggestions of the Office action. Claim 4 has not been changed with respect to "the current clutch elapsed" which is absent from that claim. The preamble of claim 1 has not been changed with respect to "the steps of" because the Preamble does not recite elements of the claim. Antecedent basis is not required with respect to a linking phrase in the Preamble.

Claims 1, 8, and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. Claims 1 and 8 are method claims. Therefore, structural cooperative relationships among the elements of method claims is confusing because the claims recite not structural elements and relationships, but method steps. The examiner is asked to clarify the basis for the rejection of Claims 1 and 8 because I cannot the meaning of the rejections in their expressed form.

In paragraph A, the Office action discusses steps 222, 224, and 226. It appears that the examiner is asking that those steps be recited in Claims 1, 12, and 13. Applicant appreciates the help of the patent examiner in formulating the claims. However, the applicant would prefer to draft the claims subject to specific and clear objections, which clearly express a basis for rejecting the claims, which the examiner may propose. Paragraph A does not clearly indicate to the applicant what changes are being suggested or required by the examiner. The examiner should clarify the basis for these rejections because they are not understood in their expressed form.

Claim 8 has been amended to clarify the claim in accordance with Paragraph B of the Office action.

Paragraph C of the Office action says that dependent Claims 13 and 14 are rejected because they "inherit that same limitations from their parent claim 12." Applicant does not understand the meaning of Paragraph C and respectfully asks the examiner to clarify its meaning.

Claims 1 and 14 have been corrected in accordance with the suggestions of the Office action, to the extent the applicant can understand the basis for the objections and rejections.

I believe it would be helpful if the examiner would please call me by telephone to discuss this response and the subject Office action.

Claims 1-4 appear now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank G. McKenzie  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 29,242

Dated: August 23, 2006  
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC  
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor  
720 Water Street  
Toledo, Ohio 43604  
(734) 542-7298  
(734) 542-9569 (fax)